

Part, a McG B?

6 Feb 89

1. "My high assessment of the risks increases
by tone of accusation"

["The risk" ~~appears~~ is higher than people think, or leaders say,
because

1) it is higher than leaders estimate or recognize;
they over-estimate the control

of US forces
of their own choices

(further escalation,
the underestimation prob the

- will lose,

* - or take high risks,

continue, despite: failure
superior

loss of original
motives, incentives
(A-bombs)

disappointed
high stakes
risks

more (improving
info

- ~~overest~~ change of every response,
its effectiveness

- every will lose control

* - role of third parties

(Castro, China, Rhee, ...)

2) I accept (fail to avoid, reject, minimize)
risks higher than

- the admit, tell public

- the should

- the expected to

(for limited goals: less & different than what the claim)

(see A-Bombs)

Kitpe
VFK

McN/Rust/Bell

Feb 89

A tiny chance of win/loss can be very
tricky — when (as McN says) I will never touch.

(What if Mc6 things risk was 10% — like Nixon —
rather than 1%? Critical zone of difference?)

see McN in July 1965!
(vs. Cuba? 1962)

DPP

Notion that X might achieve A,*
— that nothing else will
(implicitly else "loss, fails" — in SR)

*logically sound

esp when A: — some event s-r loss
or — set of Pros (Authority)

or — promised,
committed?

or — necessary to avoid
humiliation, maintain
identity or valued
membership

despite
rationalization of
McN (re US, himself)
Pros

underlying calculation
or
+ retreat

(of costs, other possible
actions/risks, probes,
law, morality)

or of hands (re SU)

and is enough to preclude or postpone
redemption, challenge of A; or of Authority
or of profits, paradigm

Examples: RT in April '65

Troops in power '65 (even for Mc6: vs. Bull)

(CBV acted like JFK or McN in Cuba II)

(see May, Reasons of History) vs. "hands/ICS."

vs. Dallas

is belief "grad process" always wins, or is better, or more wins,
in the?

(on McG B)

Feb 89

Can men in Power be Trusted with Nuclear Weapons?

1. What risks are they willing to run?

For what? When? (to avoid what
threats & why?)

2. What risks do they see?

(2 dangers: ²) like will, they will make "unrealistic" estimates
of risks, assuming non-response of opponents
non-use of thresholds

b) they will accept high risks

3. What restraints do they recognize — or fail to recognize?

How will purposes + constraints do they regard
nuclear weapons as available, advisable?
— nuclear threats, risks?

4. What are their priorities? (see JNumbur, 274, par. 1)
277-78

5. What do they do — or not — to ensure control?

Long: VFK recognized risk in CII was high,
for some "tiger" reason he couldn't
avoid taking risk: he + K were
alike — with could back down, esp. if

He took "first blood" — or "first + second blood"

JTM: allow "one bite"

(but K didn't draw
"first blood")

see RAMBO-I.

see VANA in Kontin, 172.

chip; challenge; done

see our commitment to go to
Ving Jon

7 Oct 87

Reason for risk-preference

Males & may prefer to be seen (audience
image
revealed pref
" character)
or to see themselves (self-esteem
shame
gender-identity
ego ideal)

as taking a risk:

"being able to (cope with the stress, anxiety,
fear of failure, of bodily harm, etc)
risking great loss or harm,

either for certain goods: honor
loyalty
autonomy / independence
obedience
patriotism

[this - to demonstrate the high value one puts
on that gain: see Freud to Einstein on War,
occasion it gives to demonstrate what
one will die for (risk death for)]

or even for small gains, purpose being to
demonstrate "frankness"

(or "lack of calculation" - i.e. obeying, i.e. helping
certain others...)

Thus, he prefers a gain associated with a signif. risk
to: same (or greater!) gain with no risk;
- or (to cover this pref): slightly ^{less} greater gain,
with no risk, or much less...

(Not females!)

or, to demonstrate one's ability to choose, and withstand,
both risk, and loss: thus to be eligible for
- certain jobs; esteem; membership (see fraternity
secret soc...)